

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEO B. TURNER, Jr.,

Plaintiff,

v.

YOLO POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-01417-TLN-SCR

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this action, which is referred to the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On May 20, 2025, Plaintiff filed a complaint and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). ECF Nos. 1 and 2. On June 23, 2025, the Court granted the motion for IFP and screened the complaint per the screening process required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The Court found the complaint was deficient for several reasons and allowed Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint. The Court’s order provided in relevant part that Plaintiff shall have 30 days to file an amended complaint that addresses the defects set forth in the order. ECF No. 3 at 6. The Order warned that failure to comply may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. *Id.* More than 30 days have passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **Plaintiff shall show cause, in**  
2 **writing, within 14 days**, why the failure to file an amended complaint should not result in a  
3 recommendation that this case be dismissed based on failure to state a claim and failure to follow  
4 court orders. Plaintiff may respond by filing an amended complaint that complies with the  
5 Court's prior order. If Plaintiff fails to respond, the court will recommend dismissal of this case.  
6 *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local Rule 110. Alternatively, if Plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue  
7 this action, Plaintiff may file a notice of voluntary dismissal pursuant to Rule 41 of the Federal  
8 Rules of Civil Procedure.

9 SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: August 4, 2025

11  
12   
13 SEAN C. RIORDAN  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28